DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 416 HE 021 282

AUTHOR Bensimon, Estela M.
TITLE The Meaning of "Good Presidential Leadership": A Frame Analysis. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Baltimore, MD, November 21-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *College Presidents; Higher Education; *Leadership; *Organizational Theories; *Role Perception
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

The extent to which college presidents incorporate single or multiple vantage points in evaluating good leadership was studied, based on Bolman and Deal's framework as adapted by Birnbaum. They suggest that leaders implicitly use different cognitive "frames" to define their role and understand organizational behavior. A frame helps the administrator determine what is important and what can be safely ignored. Four frames for conceptual maps for understanding organizations and effective leadership behavior were used: the bureaucratic frame, the collegial frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. The cognitive frames of 32 presidents were identified by examining interview data that reflected their espoused theories of leadership. Of concern in the analysis of frames were leadership as the process of providing direction to a group or an institution, and the leadership tactics used to provide direction. Content analysis was used to code references to elements of the four frames in an interview passage. Frame analysis resulted in a three-part classification: presidents who espoused a single-frame theory, those who combined two frames, and those with multi-frame orientations. Results are describes and a sample coding form is appended. Thirty-three references are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292416

THE MEANING OF "GOOD PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP": A FRAME ANALYSIS

Estela M. Bensimon
Assistant Director and
Research Associate
Institutional Leadership Project
National Center for Postsecondary
Governance and Finance

Teachers College, Columbia University

Presented at the National Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Baltimore, Maryland, November 21-24, 1987.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Estela M. Bensimon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This document was prepared pursuant to a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Department of Education (OERI/ED). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI/ED and no official endorsement by the OERI/ED should be inferred.

HE 021 282

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland, November 21-24, 1987. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Introduction

The idea that managers should be able to examine problems from different perspectives and along more than one value dimension (Lombard, 1971) is not new. Contingency theorists, for example, have maintained that differences in the subsytems of an organization demand different admininstrative approaches (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1973) such as the ability to use both closed and open system logic (Thompson, 1967). However, models of administrative practice to help managers understand situations, problems, and the general day-to-day life of their organizations from multiple vantage points are relatively new. Recently, Bolman and Deal (1984) proposed a framework to enable managers understand their organizations through four different organizational lenses: structural, human resources, political, and symbolic. They suggest that organizations have multiple realities and that a manager with the capacity to use multiple lenses is likely to be more effective than one who analyzes and acts on every problem using a single perspective. Similarly, Birnbaum (forthcoming) suggests that administrators must recognize the interactions between the bureaucratic, collegial, political, and symbolic processes that are present in all colleges and universities at all times if they are to be effective. Despite increasing acceptance of this notion, it is

unclear how widely the administrative styles of business or educational leaders do, in fact, incorporate multiple "vantage points."

The purpose of this study is to explore empirically the extent to which college and university presidents incorporate single or multiple vantage points in their descriptions of the meaning of good leadership. The classification of presidential vantage points is based on Bolman and Deal's framework as adapted by Birnbaum to understand academic organizations and governance patterns. Specifically, they have suggested that leaders implicitly use different cognitive "frames" to define their role and understand organizational behavior. A frame represents a distinctive cognitive lens that helps the manager of an organization or the president of a college determine what is important and what can be safely ignored. Cognitive frames determine what questions might get asked, the information that is collected, how problems are defined, and what courses of action should be taken (Bolman and Deal, 1984; Goleman, 1985). Frames influence what leaders see and what they do.

Cognitive Frames

Bolman and Deal and Birnbaum select four frames as providing a set of important conceptual maps for

understanding organizations and effective leadership behavior. Birnbaum proposes that aspects of each of the frames "seems to represent institutional functioning in some ways, at some times, in some parts of almost all colleges and universities" (p. 338). A brief description of the frames and the leadership styles that result from each is provided below.

The bureaucratic frame. This frame views organizations as mechanistic. The organizational structure is seen as hierarchical with clearly established lines of authority. The assumptions embedded in this model are that (1) the organization's goals are clear, (2) the organization is a closed system insulated from environmental penetration, and (3) the planners have the power to execute their decisions. The classic schools of thought associated with the bureaucratic frame include scientific management (Taylor, 1947), administrative principles (Fayol, 1949), and bureaucracy (Weber, 1947). More contemporary applications of the structural frame are found in decision making systems such as Management by Objectives and Planning, Programming, and Budgeting Systems. The bureaucratic frame is more useful for understanding stable organizations, or parts of organizations, in which "preferences of superiors direct the preferences of subordinates" (Birnbaum, p. 342.). Presidents with a bureaucratic frame are likely to

emphasize their role in solving problems, getting results, and establishing systems of management.

The collegial frame. Within this frame organizations are viewed as collectivities and organizational members are their primary resource. The emphasis is on human needs and how organizations can be tailored to meet them. Schools of thought associated with this frame include human relations (Mayo, 1949; Likert, 1961) and Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960). This frame pictures colleges and universities as communities of scholars (Millett, 1962) who, by virtue of their professional expertise and a shared value system, are empowered to control organizational goals. The collegial frame is useful for understanding stable organizations, or organizational subunits, "in which preferences are developed by consensus through interaction" (Birnbaum, p. 342). Presidents who perceive organizational processes through a collegial frame seek decision-making that is participative and democratic and strive to meet the needs of people and to help them realize their aspirations. Emphasis is on interpersonal skills, the ability to motivate others, and putting the interests of the institution ahead of oneself.

The political frame. In this frame organizations are viewed as composed of groups vying for power to control the allocation of scarce resources. Decisions are made

through processes of bargaining, influence, and coalition building. The underlying assumption is that colleges and universities are pluralistic entities made up of groups with different interests and values, and that conflict will erupt when resources are scarce (Baldridge, 1971). Conflict, not salient in the two previous frames, is now seen as a central feature of organizational life. Under the political frame the president is a mediator or negotiator between shifting power blocs. The president must "assemble a winning or dominant coalition that will support proposed actions--as one would in a parliamentary form of government" (Whetten, p. 40, 1984). Presidents who are guided by the political frame are advised to administer through persuasion and diplomacy; to be open and communicative; and to stay flexible on means but rigid on ends (Walker, 1979; Birnbaum, forthcoming). Presidents with a political frame are also sensitive to external interest groups, and to the strong influence they exert over the policy-making process.

The symbolic frame. Within this frame organizations are viewed as cultural systems of shared meanings and beliefs in which organizational structures and processes are invented. The task of leadership is seen as the "construction and maintenance of systems of shared meanings, paradigms, and shared languages and cultures" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 9). Leaders are expected to manage

culture by sustaining symbols and myths, maintaining and enhancing organizational sagas, and by enriching and developing the culture of the organization in other ways. Works such as Peters and Waterman's (1982) In Search of Excellence, Deal and Kennedy's (1982) Corporate Cultures, and Schein's (1985) Organizational Culture and Leadership exemplify symbolic approaches to the understanding of organizations and leadership.

In higher education the leading analysis of the presidency with a symbolic orientation is Cohen and March's (1974) Leadership and Ambiguity. In this work universities are dubbed organized anarchies because of their problematic goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation. Presidents who adhere to this frame serve primarily as catalysts or facilitators of an ongoing process. They do not so much lead the institution as channel its activities in subtle ways. They do not plan comprehensively, but try to apply preexisting solutions to problems. They emphasize the appearance of administrative actions over substance.

How frames work. Each of these frames selects different aspects of organizational behavior on which to focus; they also function as cognitive blinders in that whatever is "out of frame" may be ignored or not perceptible. For example, the president who analyzes problems through the cognitive lens of the bureaucratic

frame will probably propose solutions that stress efficiency but overlook impacts on institutional members, political ramifications implicit in the action being contemplated, or symbolic interpretations others in the organization may attach to the solution.

The difference between seeing through one frame or many frames may be related to cognitive style, specifically to the theory of integrative complexity (Tetlock, 1983). The ability to use several frames and switch from one to another may reflect a higher level of cognitive differentiation (e.g., recognizing a variety of aspects) and integration (e.g., developing complex connections among different aspects). Leaders who incorporate elements of several frames are likely to be more flexible in responding to different administrative tasks because they are able to enact different images of the organization and provide different interpretations of events. The display of complicated understandings through the use of multiple frames may be particularly important as the environment of colleges and universities becomes more complex (Birnbaum, forthcoming). On a more practical level, it cannot be overlooked that college and university presidents are expected to play many roles (see Kerr, 1963) requiring different attributes. The president who can think and act through more than one frame may be able to fulfill the many, and often conflicting,

expectations of his office more skillfully than the president who is incapable of differentiating among situational requirements.

Espoused theories of leadership. The frames-in-use by presidents may be seen in a variety of contexts, such as in their problem-solving strategies, how they interpret events, how the describe the proper role of leadership, or in the actions they take as presidents. This study identified the preferred cognitive frames implicit in presidents' interpretations of what constitutes good leadership. Interpretations of good presidential leadership are defined as "espoused theories" (Argyris and Schon, 1975) because they represent what presidents say good leadership should be, or the way they see themselves, or the way they would like others to see them. Even though espoused theories may not necessarily be an accurate representation of what presidents actually do, they are likely to influence the expectations presidents have of themselves as leaders as well as their behavior.

The Sample

The sample[1] consists of 32 presidents in a purposive sample (Selltiz, et. al, 1976), 8 each from major research

[1] To comply with pledges of confidentiality, all institutions will be described as "colleges" and presidents will be referred to with masculine pronouns.

universities, public four-year colleges, independent colleges, and community colleges that are participating in a national study of institutional leadership. The sample includes 16 "new" presidents (in office for three years or less) and 16 "old" presidents (in office for five years or more). All of the presidents were interviewed for three hours during 1986-87.

Method

The study identified the 32 presidents' cognitive frames by examining interview data that reflected their espoused theories of leadership. Presidents' espoused theories of leadership were constructed by abstracting data from the total interview transcript, based on their ability to respond to the following analytic question: How does President X define good presidential leadership? To identify presidents' frames, espoused theories of leadership were analyzed as if they were made up of two distinct components: leadership as the process of providing direction to a group or an institution and the leadership tactics used to provide direction. (The coding sheet is included in Appendix A.)

Content analysis was used to code references to elements of the four frames in a sustained interview passage. Presidents were considered to use a frame if their responses contained at least two references to it.

Presidents could thus depict themselves as espousing as many as four frames and as few as one. For example, when President #1 said that a good leader "understands and respects the institution and reads the written histories," he described a characteristic stance found in the symbolic frame, and was recorded as espousing that frame. President #1, in his interviews, never espoused the bureaucratic frame; gave three separate depictions of the collegial frame, five of the political, and two of the symbolic frame. His dominant espoused theory was thus classified as including three frames, all except the bureaucratic.

Frame analysis resulted in a three-part classification: presidents who espoused a single-frame theory, those who combined two frames, and those with multi-frame orientations.

Results

Of the 32 presidents, thirteen espoused a single frame, eleven espoused two frames, seven espoused three frames, and one espoused four frames.

In the first part of this section we describe the three frame categories using excerpts from the interviews with the presidents. Next, the findings are analyzed by institutional type and length of president's tenure.

Single-frame theories

Single-frame theories of good presidential leadership have a unitary theme that is clearly identifiable with a specific organizational model. The language used to express the process of providing leadership and to describe the tactics of leadership is consistent with a single-focus orientation. The difference among single-frame theories, of course, is that the content varies according to the frame in use.

Presidents espousing single-frame theories sometimes mentioned other viewpoints but not so much to introduce a second dimension as to reinforce the single-frame perspective. For example, one president with a bureaucratic frame explained that "coming across with your main priorities is important so that you can show you are in control, that you are the president." Even though establishing priorities is advocated for its symbolic rather than instrumental value, the intent is to show control, to solidify a bureaucratic image of good presidential leadership. As Table 1 shows, presidents expressed single-frame orientations of all four kinds; however, two interview excerpts will suffice to illustrate what such presidents had to say. A president with a bureaucratic frame looks at leadership as:

> the person in charge who focuses on the obligation to make decisions, to provide a sense

> of direction. The president's principal responsibility is to make decisions.

In true bureaucratic form, this president saw his role as maintaining an efficiently-run institution by making decisions and structuring and organizing the institution. Implicit within this definition is the image of the president as decisive and action-oriented.

Another president spoke about presidential leadership almost exclusively through the collegial frame:

> I define a leader as a person who provides a vision or direction for a group which takes the capability of the group and potential benefits into account...A [president] has to understand what the faculty is feeling and needing and address oneself to meeting the needs and getting people to feel good about the institution.

Unlike the president in the first sample, this one places emphasis on providing direction by being responsive to group needs, rather than on decision-making capabilities. He sees leadership as attending to the needs of people in order to build commitment and loyalty to the institution. Although the realities these two presidents construct and the ways in which they enact their roles are different, both presidents have a single-frame orientation to leadership.

Thirteen presidents (41%) had single-frame theories. Table 1 shows that presidents expressed single-frame orientations of all four kinds; however, they were more

likely to espouse the bureaucratic and collegial frames than the political and symbolic.

Table 1

Espoused theories with a single frame orientation

Frames	Number
Bureaucratic	5
Collegial	4
Political	1
Symbolic	3
Total	13

Paired-frame theories

Paired-frame theories consist of two frames coupled in a complementary way. In several instances there may be a functional division between the two frames. One frame might be relied on to provide a global definition of what it means to be a good presidential leader, while more concrete explanations, elaborations, or clarifications are provided through the second frame. Even though one frame is relied on to give the initial response as to the meaning of good presidential leadership and another to

translate or enhance it, each frame by definition contributes a different dimension and makes the full viewpoint more complex.

An example of complementary use of two frames is provided by a president who articulated his theory through the collegial and symbolic frames. Starting off with the collegial frame, he explained that good presidential leadership means "accomplishing commonly determined goals in such a way that all involved are satisfied with the path taken to get there." He continued on, now from a symbolic stance, to say that

> presidential leadership also means the development and interpretation of the vision, and granting permission to pursue the vision, free up as much the obstacles that prevent the institution from doing it effectively.

By introducing the second frame an innocuous sounding response was transformed into a significantly more important and interesting statement about the meaning of good presidential leadership.

Another president who presented his theory by combining the collegial and symbolic frames said, employing the symbolic frame, that good leadership requires you to:

> do a lot of listening and solicit the dreams and hopes from the people; tell the people about the good things you are finding and in three to six months take these things and report them as the things you would like to see happen.

A good leader, in his eyes, searches among the activities of the institution and selects those that should be retained as institutional goals. He interprets his role as one of sense-making (Birnbaum, 1987) and sees leadership as the management of meaning (Smircich and Morgan, 1982). He constructs reality not by imposing his image of what the institution should be doing, but by transforming people's desires and ambitions for the institution ("the good things you are finding") into its plans and goals. Even though he relies primarily on the symbolic frame to describe the meaning of good presidential leadership, his tactics are influenced by the collegial frame. This is particularly evident when he adds that

> leaders are good listeners, they are able to paraphrase back to people what they have said accurately. You need to work with what they have said and how they feel. You have to be able to read people's emotions.

Another president illustrated a different complementary pairing. He relied first on the symbolic frame perspective, to explain the importance of having different repertoires:

> The trick is to know what guise to put on and to be able to do it. Some people can only use one guise and as a result they are good leaders only in certain situations.

Then, he listed the kinds of things that are important for

leaders to accomplish:

> [you should] do your homework, get to know your immediate staff--their backgrounds, make them relax with you. Get a master key and drop in around campus. Accept all speaking engagements. Go to the faculty leaders' offices and talk to them so they will know that you are willing to listen to them. Have a beer with them. But don't make any promises.

Here he has made a noticeable shift to the political frame by emphasizing the importance of understanding key individuals who could be potential friends or opponents. Had he continued to speak through the lens of the symbolic frame, he might have stressed a simpler theme of establishing an image of accessibility.

Summarizing his approach, this president also speaks from the symbolic frame:

> There is a need for a president to coast over a total problem and know when to swoop down and give total attention to one issue. At such points, I call the people with information and suck up everybody's files. I can do that in one night. It is total immersion. I decide what needs to be done. I give it to my staff to do. And then I soar again. This is an important thing for a president to do.

The "scanning and selecting" technique allows this president to exercise leadership by being selective and by limiting the number of problems on which he concentrates. It should not go unnoticed that the president using this approach sees himself as singling out important problems by taking symbolic and dramatic action. He then delegates responsibility for implementing the solutions he has

worked out to the staff. (But he is dramatically solving problems and making decisions.)

Of the 32 presidents, 11 (34%) used two frames to express the meaning of good presidential leadership. Table 2 shows that paired-frame theories are distributed among four possible combinations. Missing combinations consist of the bureaucratic and collegial frames and bureaucratic and symbolic. Almost one-half of the paired-frame theories were made up of the collegial and symbolic frames. The symbolic frame either in combination with the collegial or the political frames was found to be present in 7 of the paired-frame theories.

Table 2
Theories espousing a paired-frame orientation

Frame Combinations	Number
Bureaucratic/Collegial	0
Bureaucratic/Political	1
Bureaucratic/Symbolic	0
Collegial/Political	3
Collegial/Symbolic	5
Political/Symbolic	2
Total	11

Multi-frame theories

Multi-frame theories display at least three of the

four possible frames and represent, therefore, the greatest frame complexity. Espousing a multi-frame theory implies the ability to shift frames in response to situational circumstances.

One president ran counter to pattern. In addition to being the one president who espoused all four frames he was "new" and the only first-time president in the sample who provided a multi-frame orientation. This president combines the collegial and bureaucratic frames to explain that good presidential leadership

> means to help a group of people achieve a set of agreed-upon goals. There are things that make that happen--having clear goal-setting, good communication, good management.

He then went on to list additional characteristics, spanning all four frames, which he also thought were needed "to make it all move forward." The bureaucratic frame appeared again in the necessity of "having a clear sense of what the important goals are and a real desire to take leadership responsibility." Then, the collegial frame underlay a sense that "to get the group to the goals" a president needs "a real affirming attitude toward all the players in the group." "Affirming people," he explained:

> ... means people getting credit for what they are doing and being told that it is important, and being encouraged to be creative. But this

> is not a pretense; you must be honest with them. It requires honesty; it is not pablum. You must give authentic recognition and encouragement. You must respect the individual's special contributions.

As he proceeded to give some examples of good leadership tactics, he shifted to the political frame:

> I would say invest time out with the troops--with faculty, students, the administration. Be very close to the ground. Being liked is not trivial.

And he concluded by combining the symbolic and political models.

> I am really good at being casual and talking to people, but I remain clear on what path we will go down. You need a leadership game plan. You can't get the long view if you constantly have your ear to the ground. But it is important for a leader to be a cheerleader, an affirmer.

This president showed a keen awareness of the four approaches and was able to switch from one to the other as seemed needed or desirable. From the outset he framed his explanation in a bureaucratic perspective, for example, in stressing the importance of goal-setting and good management. But at the same time was sensitive to the importance of communication as a way of projecting an image of respect for others and flexibility in using their talents. So it is instructive to note he used collegial tactics, symbolically, to temper the bureaucratic

orientation.

Table 3

Espoused theories with a multi-frame orientation

Frames	Number
Bct/Coll/Pol/Symb	1
Bct/Coll/Pol	2
Bct/Pol/Symb	0
Bct/Coll/Symb	0
Coll/Pol/Symb	5
Total	8

Table 3 displays the frame combinations among the eight presidents espousing multi-frame theories. With three frames it was possible to have five different combinations; however, all eight theories espousing three frames clustered in three of the combinations.

More than one-half of the multi-frame theories clustered in the combination consisting of the collegial, political, and symbolic frames. Looking back at the paired-frame theories it can be seen that these, like the multi-frame theories, had a similar pattern of distribution in that they tended to cluster in the combinations made up by the collegial and symbolic frames and, although less so, in the pairing consisting of the collegial and political frames.

The excerpts included in this section illustrate ways in which the frames singly and in combination result in vastly different interpretations as to the meaning of good presidential leadership, and the data tables showed the kinds of frame combinations most and least likely to occur within the pair- and multi-frame category. The data analysis presented thus far has focussed on the distribution of the espoused theories in relation to frame content.

In the section that follows the results are presented in terms of frame complexity (i.e., single versus multi-frame orientations) in relation to two variables--institutional type and president's length of tenure.

Frame Analysis by Institutional Type

Table 4 shows the distribution of single, paired, and multi-frame theories by institutional type. The most striking aspect of the distribution is that universities, public comprehensive colleges, and independent colleges spread out across the three frame categories; community colleges, on the other hand, converge in the category of single-frame theories.

Table 4
Frame analysis by institutional type

Single-Frame	Paired-Frame	Multi-Frame
Universities	2	3	3
Public Colleges	3	3	2
Independent C.	3	3	2
Community C.	5	2	1
Total	13 (41%)	11 (34%)	8 (25%)

The five single-frame theories provided by community college presidents were spread out across three of the four frames. The bureaucratic frame was found in two, as was the collegial, and the symbolic frame in one.
Nine of the eleven paired-frame theories were espoused, in equal numbers, by presidents of universities, public four-year colleges and independent colleges. Both paired-frame theories espoused by community college presidents fell into the collegial and symbolic frames.

Multi-frame orientations were discernible only in one-fourth of the espoused theories. One was espoused by a community college president; two, each, were espoused by presidents of public four-year colleges and independent colleges presidents, and three by university presidents.

Frame analysis and presidents' length of tenure

The results of frame analysis by presidents' length of tenure, shown in Table 5, reveal different cluster patterns for old and new presidents. All but five of the old presidents espoused theories classified as paired or multi-frame. In contrast, one-half of the new presidents were clustered in the single-frame category. New presidents espousing single-frame theories came from three institutional types: three were presidents of community colleges, three of public four-year colleges, and two of independent colleges. Old presidents espousing single-frame theories included two from universities, two from communitycolleges, and one from an independent college.

Table 5
Frame Categories and Presidents' Length of Tenure

	Old	New
Single-frame	5	8
Paired-frame	6	5
Multi-frame	5	3
Total	16	16

There were three new presidents in the sample who previously had been presidents of at least one other

institution. Notably, two of these espoused a multi-frame theory; the third one had a paired-frame theory. Only one of the three new presidents with a multi-frame theory was a first-time president.

Discussion

The findings show that the theories of leadership presidents espouse are underrepresented in the multi-frame category. This exploratory empirical study suggests that multi-frame orientations may be infrequent in presidents. Furthermore, multi-frame theories are more likely to be formed by the integration of three rather than four frames. Espousing a four-frame orientation is probably exceptional because few individuals display the cognitive complexity implied by this orientation.

The most distinct pattern emerging from the analysis by institutional type is evidenced by the distribution of community colleges and universities. Community colleges cluster in the single frame category and universities in the paired and multi-frame categories. Public and independent colleges are more uniformly distributed across the three frame categories. The theories of leadership espoused by community college presidents tended to be concentrated in the single-frame category. Two factors might contribute to this. Structurally and administratively, community colleges have been described

as more closely aligned with the bureaucratic model of governance due to a high level of administrative dominance (Baldridge et al, 1978; Bensimon, 1984 ;Reyes and Twombly, 1987). But these results do not support this commonly accepted view. Only two of the five community college presidents with a single-frame had a bureaucratic orientation. The other three were distributed between the collegial and symbolic frames.

The finding that four out of the five single-frame theories espoused by community college presidents have either a bureaucratic or collegial orientation may be tapping tendencies to view the organization as a closed system. Presidents of community colleges are perhaps prone to closed system views because decision-making is centralized; and they, rather than the faculty, control transactions with the external environment.

An alternative explanation is suggested by the fact that three of the five community college presidents who had a single-frame orientation were new, and none of them had a bureaucratic orientation. But, the two community college presidents classified as having bureaucratic orientations were "old." Possibly there is a trend, among the newer generation of community college presidents, as Vaughan (1986) has suggested, toward leadership approaches that encourage greater participation and shared decision-making.

These results showed that new presidents were likely to provide theories of leadership that hold a single-frame orientation, while multi-frame views were found to be held almost exclusively by old presidents and new presidents who had held at least one other presidency in the past. Quite possibly the more experienced presidents have assimilated the potential complexities of the role and so can shift among frames with greater ease. Research studies of cognitive complexity and managerial experience show, as common sense would suggest, that the move away from simplicity to complexity is a developmental process (Bartuneck, Gordon, and Weathersby, 1983). Similarly, the process of taking charge by new managers has been described as a series of stages characterized by the performance of progressively complex tasks (Gabarro, 1987). These studies imply that cognitive complexity is a function of experiential learning, suggesting that the absence of multi-frame theories among new presidents is related to newness. A study of shifts in the pre-and postselection rhetoric of national candidates for the presidency has shown, for example, that their policy statements became more integratively complex once they are elected to office (Tetlock, 1983). The same may be true with new presidents, initially they may appear as single-frame because the theories of leadership they espouse reflect normative perceptions of the role rather than

their experience in the position. Alternatively, it could be suggested that very few new presidents evolve into multi-frame leaders. The presidency, for most individuals, represents the culmination of an academic career (Cohen and March, 1974); consequently, the theories of leadership presidents espouse (also, their behavior) will be conditioned by what worked in the past. Thus, if a president's past experiences and successes are associated with a single-frame orientation he may be resistant to change, unless confronted with alternatives (Brookfield, 1987).

Implications

The four-frame scheme used in this study is not in itself a novel approach to understanding leaders and leadership. Up to now the treatment of the four models has remained, for the most part, at a high level of abstraction; consequently, there is a tendency to consider only two possible kinds of manifestations, either at its simplest single-frame level or most complicated four-frame one. The present approach made it possible to look for all possible combinations, and to uncover combinations not readily seen in more abstract treatments.

The three frame categories emerging from our study, in particular the finding that the majority of espoused

theories were found to be concentrated among the single and paired-frames, have implications for understanding presidential leadership in higher education. Leading proponents (Bolman and Deal, 1984; Birnbaum, 1987) of the four-frame/model framework suggest that there will be qualitative differences among leaders who have a single versus a multi-frame perspective. In Bolman and Deal's judgment modern organizations are so complex that they cannot be understood from a single-frame perspective; moreover, they assert that a single-frame perspective "is likely to produce error and self-imprisonment" (p. 4) for the manager. They suggest that:

> managers who understand and use only one or two of the frames are like a highly specialized species: They may be well adapted to a very narrow environment but extremely vulnerable to changes in climate or competition. (p. 278)

To the extent it proves true that multi-frame leadership is better suited to a turbulent environment, we might find quite a few presidents who are not effective. Perhaps what these findings suggest is that rather than looking for the leader who has successfully integrated the four frames into his leadership style, it may be more advantageous and practical to attain multi-frame leadership by forming executive teams whose members have complementary frame orientations (Sayles, 1979).

The primary intent of this study was to explore the

cognitive lenses implicit in the theories of good leadership espoused by presidents. Questions that emerged from these results may lead to the development of new understandings of presidential cognitive frames and their consequences for leadership effectiveness.

References

Argyris, C. and Schon, D. A. Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Baldridge, J. V. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G., and Riley, G. L. Policy Making and Effective Leadership: A National Study of Academic Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Bartuneck, J. M., Gordon, J. R., and Weathersby, R. P. "Developing 'Complicated' Understanding in Administrators." Academy of Management Review, 1983, 8, 273-284.

Bensimon, E. M. "Selected Aspects of Governance: An ERIC Review." Community College Review, 1984, 12, 54-61.

Birnbaum, R. How Colleges Work: Patterns of Organization, Management, and Leadership in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, forthcoming.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Brookfield, S. Developing Critical Thinking. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Deal, T. E. and Kennedy, A. K. Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Organizational Life. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Fayol, H. General Principles of Management in Pugh, D. S. (ed.) Organization Theory. England: Penguin Books, Ltd, 135-156.

Gabarro, J. J. The Dynamics of Taking Charge. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press, 1987.

Goleman, D. Vital Lies, Simple Truths: The Psychology of Self-Deception. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc. 1985.

Kast, F. E. and Rosenzweig, J. R. Contingency Views of Organization and Management. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1973.

Kerr, C. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Likert, R. The Principle of Supportive Relationships in Pugh, D. S. (ed.) Organization Theory. England: Penguin Books, Ltd, 293-316.

Lombard, F. F. Relativism in Organizations. Harvard Business Review, March-April, 1971, 55-65.

Mayo, E. Hawthorne and the Western Electric Company in Pugh, D. S. (ed.) Organization Theory. England: Penguin Books, Ltd, 279-292.

McGregor, D. Theory X and Theory Y in Pugh, D. S. (ed.) Organization Theory. England: Penguin Books, Ltd, 317-333.

Millett, J. D. The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H. Jr. In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies. New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

Pfeffer, J. "Management as Symbolic Action: The Creation and Maintenance of Organizational Paradigms." In Research in Organizational Behavior, 1981, 3, 1-52.

Reyes, P. and Twombly, S. B. "Perceptions of Contemporary Governance in Community Colleges: An Empirical Study." Community College Review, 1987, 14, 4-12.

Sayles, L. R. Leadership: What Effective Managers Really Do...And How They Do It. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

Schein, E. H. Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L. S. and Cook, S. W. Research Methods in Social Relations, 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Taylor, F. W. Scientific Management in Pugh, D. S. (ed.) Organization Theory. England: Penguin Books, Ltd, 157-176.

Tetlock, P. E. "Cognitive Style and Political Ideology. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 1, 1983, 118-126.

Thompson, J. D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.

Vaughan, G. B. The Community College Presidency. New York: ACE/MacMillan, 1986.

Walker, D. E. The Effective Administrator. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Weber, M. Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy in Pugh, D. S. (ed.) Organization Theory. England: Penguin Books, Ltd, 15-27.

Whetten, D. A. Effective Administrators: Good Management on the College Campus. Change, 16, 8, 1984, 39-43.

Appendix A

Sample Coding Form

WHAT IS GOOD PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP?

I. Providing Direction for the Institution

010. Bureaucratic Frame:

____ Overseeing goal setting and attainment (e.g., "identify the goals to be accomplished")
____ structuring and organizing the institution; (e.g., "after setting the goals you have to structure the organization to do it well")
____ establishing priorities; (e.g., "find out what has to be done first")
____ identifying and recruiting personnel; ("get people in positions")
____ other

011. Collegial Frame:

____ Move people to achieve goals of the institution; (e.g., "getting people to coalesce behind the mission)
____ inspire/motivate/stimulate/encourage people; (e.g.,"unlocking the potential that exists in faculty and staff")
____ use collective action to achieve the goals; ("get people to rally around that collective action")
____ taking group capabilities and aspirations into consideration; (e.g., "you can't move faster than you bring people along")
____ other

012. Political Frame:

____ Mobilize resources of the organization (e.g., "you lead the faculty by...getting funding resources and unleashing their talents")
____ Monitor internal and external environments (e.g., "pull out from the environment the signals")
____ Determine expectations of constituencies (e.g., when the environment is hostile it is because the institution is not doing something")
____ Establish relationships with important constituencies (e.g., develop a good working relationship with the board")
____ Other

013. Symbolic:

____ Provide a vision (e.g., "let the vision emerge from what is being talked about on campus")
____ Understand the institution (e.g., "the leader must assimilate the goals; listen a lot to learn about the institution")
____ Borrow ideas (e.g., "look beyond the moment...borrow some ideas from other people")
____ Honors accomplishments (e.g., "people getting credit for what they are doing and being told that it is important")
____ Other (e.g., "you must lose pride of authorship")

II. Leadership Tactics

020. Bureaucratic Frame:

____ Having goals (e.g., "you have to have legitimate goals")
____ Introducing changes (e.g., "if I have not brought anything new to the college then I have not been a leader but a technician")
____ Being decisive/action-oriented (e.g., "you have to be action-oriented")
____ Being strong/authoritative (e.g., "must be able to make decisions that often hurt people")
____ Other

030. Collegial Frame:

____ Setting an example (e.g., "it means leading by example")
____ Showing loyalty/commitment to the institution (e.g., "don't show loyalty or devotion or tell war stories about the last place...your new college should get your exclusive attention")
____ Meeting group needs (e.g., "sense where people want to go")
____ Using a team approach (e.g., leadership is not exerted by one person, it is shared by all participants")
____ Building consensus (e.g., "the real function of a leader is to establish consensus")
____ Other

040. Political Fame:

____ Knowing when to exercise strong leadership (e.g., "don't do anything drastic before you have to")
____ Doing one's homework (e.g., "learn about the situation, give yourself time to evaluate the situation")
____ Understanding key individuals (e.g., "understand the key individuals and what makes them tick")
____ Being open and communicative (e.g., "it is important to listen and develop lines of communication so that when you are ready to take action you have friends")
____ Having a game plan (e.g., "you need a leadership game plan")
____ Other

050. Symbolic Frame:

____ Taking action to establish a desired image (e.g., "become known quickly in the state structure because you need to create the right perceptions")
____ Being flexible but having an agenda (e.g., "I am being really good at being casual and talking to people, but I remain clear on what path we will go down")
____ Adapting leadership style to situations ("some people can only use one guise and as a result are they are good leaders only in certain situations")
____ Not creating major shock waves (e.g., "I don't believe in making unwarranted changes")
____ Other